# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

## MEMORANDA

Announcement of a change in the meeting-place of the Archaeological Institute of America comes just when many scholarly societies are facing the question thoughtfully answered by the archaeologists. Considerations of the travel burden caused the railroads and of the wartime activity of many members have forced several organizations to debate the desirability of general meetings. Only one full day will be given to the sessions of the Archaeological Institute at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, December 30, with possibly a session on the following morning. This truncated meeting will follow the Monday and Tuesday abbreviated congress of the Philological Association in Cincinnati.

A neat and thoroughly informative newcomer in the ranks of classical publications is the October issue (Vol. 1, No. 1) of the Bulletin of the Pennsylvania State Association of Classical Teachers, whose postmark alone proves that both the neatness and the interest come from the diligence of the teachers of Latin of a superior community. A glimpse of local history of that community is enough to prove to a neighbor and observer that the reason the community is academically superior is the long devotion of its schools to sound study of Latin.

News of the classical confraternity in Pennsylvania schools, with two timely emphases, crowds the Bulletin's four small pages. One emphasis is on the central interest of Pennsylvania teachers in their new school Latin syllabus, the other is on the encouragement these industrious teachers are receiving from school officials, from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, for instance, and from teachers' organizations.

The board of editors is headed by Miss Lila A. Adams, Junior High School, Butler, and Miss Mary G. Dougherty, High School, Beaver Falls, and includes Miss Mary Glowacki, Nanticoke; Miss Evelyn Luckey, Bethlehem; Miss Cornelia Bowen, Bala Cynwyd; Dr.

Oswald Kuehne, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia; Miss Elva Lippi, William Penn High School, Harrisburg; Miss Dorothy Williams, Clearfield; Miss Helen Hersperger, Indiana; Miss Alta Fretts, Langley High School, Pittsburgh; Miss Josephine Scouller, Northeast; Mr. Norman McCormick, Aliquippa. All have the congratulations and good wishes of CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

Community chest contributions from major American cities will this year go to Greece in the form of food and medicines, but it is in harmony with the democratic ideals which we learned from Greece that along with these millions will go the two tons of pennies that Glasgow school children contributed, the $25,000 subscribed by New York fur workers, and the profits from the copies which American admirers of Greek are buying of such books as Greece Fights, Greece Gallant and Glorious, and Greece 1821-1941.

A recent communication from Professor Bayard Q. Morgan of Stanford University urges formation of a body of all teachers of all languages to combat the tendency "to abandon the discipline of formal language study as a foundation stone in American education." The former managing editor of The Modern Language Journal finds very dangerous the attitude expressed by school administrators in a survey made in June, 1942. Asked for an opinion on the worth of foreign languages in teachers' preparation, only a fourth of the schoolmen participating considered classical languages desirable in the training of secondary teachers. About half as many approved of such experience in the education of elementary teachers. Slightly larger numbers considered modern languages good for prospective teachers. Dr. Morgan wishes to call a meeting at the coming convention of the Modern Language Association for organization of a body to bring pressure in favor of language study.

## ANCIENT CONVOYING

Among the grave perils of which Circe warned Odysseus were the Roving Rocks (Πλαγκταὶ Πέτραι) near Scylla and Charybdis (Odyssey 12.59ff.). No one could venture near them and not suffer disaster. The Argo alone was an exception; and she succeeded only through a divine intervention: ἀλλ' Ἥρη παρέπεμψεν (ib. 72).

Of the various meanings of the word παραπέμπειν and its derivatives in the sense of sending or escorting past or through, its use as a technical term for convoying ships through waters made dangerous by an enemy is particularly noteworthy. While there is apparently no detailed ancient treatise on this device for enforcing transport security, and modern discussion of the ancient practice is confined to occasional sentences and footnotes, there is fairly abundant testimony, especially in Greek,[1] to show that convoying was commonly resorted to, probably at least since the time of the Peloponnesian War; in fact, the conditions and exigencies around the Mediterranean were usually such as to render the measure or its equivalent an almost constant necessity. Without making pretensions of an exhaustive survey, I here offer the materials I have collected over some time from both Greek and Latin sources.

It should be noted in the beginning that the simple verb πέμπειν also occurs in the meaning of 'to escort', 'to send with an escort'; and that Homer uses it repeatedly to designate more specifically 'safe transportation or conduct by ship.' Thus Alcinous asks Odysseus concerning his home country and town, that the Phaeacian ships may conduct him there (Odyssey 8.556):

ὄφρα σε τῇ πέμπωσι . . . νῆες.

It was said that Poseidon was jealous of the Phaeacians because they were "safe conductors of all men" (πομποὶ ἀπήμονες . . . ἁπάντων, 566) and that some day he would shatter their νῆα ἐκ πομπῆς ἀνιοῦσαν (567-8). Further, the Phaeacian sailors who are about to return Odysseus to Ithaca are termed πομπῆες ἀγανοί ("illustrious conductors" ib. 13.71).

It is of course an old truism that the ancient sea carriers of men and goods as a rule hugged the seashores. Not only during war were the natural hazards accompanying shipping increased; piracy and privateering scarcely ever gave it a respite from peril even in times of peace.[2] Protection against attack was sought in friendly harbors, or was provided by strategically placed warcraft or shore garrisons or even by troops marching along the coast.

When Philip used the method last mentioned, he called it παραπέμπειν (see below). This term is employed regularly when armed ships serving as escort give protection. Already the introductory Odyssean reminiscence of Hera guarding the passage of the Argonauts quite clearly illustrates the original and dominant meaning of παραπέμπειν and its differentiation from the simple verb. In its nautical import the latter connotes merely 'to escort', 'to send with an escort', 'to convoy' in the sense of 'accompany'—always, it seems, on one and the same ship—for the purpose of giving guidance or protection; the compound verb contains the added idea of (sending,) guiding, conducting ships *along* or *past* a shore or some dangerous object, usually near shore—a pirate craft, for example, foraying from some hidden inlet. The "escorter" or "convoyer" in this sense is an outside agent travelling in a separate ship, though quite evidently Hera did not require such in her conduct of Odysseus.

Presuming that the occasional early use of the transitive verb πέμπειν in a nautical sense is known, the basic meaning of the compound should be fairly evident. Yet these preliminary remarks seem necessary as the preposition παρά in its meaning of proximity, and association of the Greek verb with the English 'convoy' (<OF. *convoier*<LL. *con+viare*), easily lead to thinking of παραπέμπειν in terms of παραπλεῖν, a sailing of the convoying ship *near, beside* or *by the side of* the vessel convoyed. To my knowledge παραπλεῖν itself is never used to designate the act of convoying; though in a passage (to be cited presently) from Polyaenus it records a maneuver undertaken during an attack upon a convoy. In this connection it is interesting to note the use of both verbs in the Homeric passage referred to: the Argo "passed by" the threatening cliffs (κείνη γε παρέπλω, 69), for Hera "escorted her by" (παρέπεμψεν, 72). Not a concept of the protector's nearness to the protected dominates the verb παραπέμπειν (and its derivatives), but rather an indication of the nearness of an endangering object against which protection is given.

In a passage of Xenophon's Hellenica (7.2.18-23) concerning some overland convoying the prepositional component of παραπέμπειν seems to convey the prevailing note of sending or escorting safely to (to the side of) a place. The author states regarding a period of Peloponnesian Kleinstaaterei that the Phliasians, hard beset by the Argives to the south and by Sicyonians to the north, found themselves in particularly desperate straits. In 366 they engaged the Athenian adventurer-general Chares to convoy provisions to them: σφίσι παραπέμψαι τὴν παραπομπήν. They also asked him to

[1]A number of passages is listed by Liddell-Scott-Jones s.vv. παραπέμπειν, παραπομπός, παραπομπή.

[2]Cf. especially H. A. Ormerod, Piracy in the Ancient World, University Press, Liverpool 1924 and the bibliography listed in his preface; also A. Köster, Das Antike Seewesen, Scoetz & Parrhysius, Berlin 1923, the chapter "Die Seeräuber," 235-50.

escort their non-combatants to Pellene; here the verb συνεκπέμπειν is used; and when with his assistance they had taken Thyamia, an outpost being fortified to tighten the blockade about them, and were strengthening the place as their own, their Corinthian allies sent them daily convoys of provisions: ἑκάστης ἡμέρας παραπομπαὶ ἐγίγνοντο. The orator Aeschines states (2.168) that he was among the Athenian militia which accompanied Chares to Phlius: συμπαραπέμπων . . . τὴν εἰς Φλειοῦντα παραπομπήν (cf. A. Schaefer, Demosthenes und seine Zeit², Teubner, Leipzig 1885-7, I.103-4: 237). I call attention to these overland convoys as a further precaution against too readily presuming sea escort in passages that contain but scanty topographical detail, e.g., concerning the παραπομπή mentioned by [Aristotle,] Oec. 2.30.1.

Concerning protection given by armed ships serving as escorts to other ships there is no early evidence. The histories of Herodotus and Thucydides contain no more than probable indications that this measure was actually resorted to. Ormerod (op.cit., 118, n. 3), acknowledging an observation made to him by W. R. Halliday, refers to Herodotus 3.129-38 as an instance of "escorting in general." The passage contains the celebrated account of the fortunes of the Crotoniat physician Democedes. Having cured Darius and Atossa at Susa, he was requested to serve as a guide to fifteen prominent Persians detailed to spy out the coastlines of the far-flung Greek world. He was to receive a merchantman to carry gifts to his relatives at home. The commission went promptly to the shipyards of Sidon, where they engaged two Phoenician warships and Democedes' freighter. As the long route of the freighter lay along regions infested by pirates and predatory tribes (138), it might be assumed that the triremes were taken along to give convoy protection to the treasure. But this purpose is not stated. Moreover, the ships were to provide a safe voyage to the important commission and, as has been pointed out to me, they were to prevent Democedes, whose return was most emphatically commanded by Darius, from running away. Yet he actually did run away at Tarentum through the intervention of Aristophilides (136).

Again, convoying is inferable, though not mentioned, in the passage in Thucydides (6.42-4) describing an Athenian and allied armada that set out in 415 from Corcyra for Sicily. There were 134 triremes and two Rhodian pentecontori, to which were added thirty merchantmen carrying provisions and a hundred other vessels requisitioned for the expedition, besides many other ships that went along voluntarily. Again, Xenophon reports (Hellenica 1.1.36) that in 410 several of the ships sent in command of Clearchus to cut off the Athenian grain supply at the source came to grief when they reached the Hellespont and were attacked by nine Attic warships. Though concerning these it is merely stated that they were strategically stationed, it seems probable that they actually also convoyed merchantmen for some distance.

Considering the enormous demands made upon sea transportation during the Peloponnesian War, the absence of indubitable testimony for convoys by the historian Thucydides is especially striking. In good part this is compensated for by a late report in detail of a σίτου παραπομπή successfully captained by an eminent participant in the war, the Corinthian Ariston.[3] Concerning him Polyaenus records, without mentioning time and place, the following (5.13.1):

Ariston was escorting three merchantmen with one armed ship (μιᾷ νηὶ τρεῖς ὁλκάδας σῖτον ἀγούσας παρέπεμπεν). Suddenly when a calm befell them, an enemy trireme appeared. Ariston "ordered the merchantmen to close up, while he lay alongside: τὰς τρεῖς ὁλκάδας συναγαγών, ἐγγὺς αὐτῶν παρέπλει. If the enemy attacked him first, it would come under fire from the merchantmen: ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν [ταῖς] σιτηγοῖς προσβάλλοιτο βέλεσι πολλοῖς. If it attacked the merchantmen from the other flank, he himself would sail round the convoy and take the enemy ship on the beam, or cut her off between his own vessel and the convoy: αὐτὸς περιπλέων ἐκ πλαγίων βλάπτοι τὴν πολεμίαν τριήρη καὶ ἀπολαμβάνοι μέσην αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ὁκλάδων."

The period of Macedonian ascendancy finds sea convoys mentioned frequently in the Demosthenic body of orations. We owe this evidence largely to litigation in the courts, litigation that grew out of the special services Athens demanded more and more from her wealthier citizens.

Thus, when Polycles for more than five months failed to relieve Apollodorus, son of Pasion, in the trierarchy terminating during September 361, the latter incurred great additional expense. Extraordinary demands for convoy service placed a particularly heavy strain upon his resources. His plea in 358 (Blass) for compensation (ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπιτριηραρχήματος) bears the name of Demosthenes as logograph: [Dem.] 50.

Apollodorus' year as trierarch was about to expire when the Athenian commander stationed at Sestus, Timomachus, decided to undertake an expedition to Pontic Hierum. He gave orders to Apollodorus: πλεῖν . . . ἐπὶ τὴν παραπομπὴν τοῦ σίτου (17); for the Byzantines and Chalcedonians were again stopping vessels sailing through the Bosporus, forcing them to unload their cargoes of grain. Apollodorus paid off his old sailors and, when he had borrowed considerable money—some of it at 12½ per cent—to engage the

3Cf. Thucydides 7.39.2. My offering of the text from Polyaenus is indebted to the excellent paraphrase by Ormerod, loc. cit. The description of Ariston's tactics may be compared with some paragraphs in a recent book by Captain D. J. Munro, Convoys, Blockades and Mystery Towers, Lows, Marston & Co., London 1932; see particularly pages 16-7 and 42-70, "Commodore's Instructions."

best obtainable seamen for the dangerous assignment, his pentecontarch suddenly became ill. Apollodorus paid his way home and engaged another captain for the pentecontorus he had hired. Finally, he weighed anchor: ἀνηγόμην ἐπὶ τὴν παραπομπὴν τοῦ σίτου (19).

When the flotilla returned to Sestus 45 days later, Apollodorus had already served two months beyond his term. With Polycles still absent, Timomachus acceded to the request of the Maroneans: τὰ πλοῖα παραπέμψαι τὰ σιτηγά (20). The trierarchs present, among them the veteran Apollodorus, received orders to accompany him and to tow the freighters.

And now the dangers for Apollodorus because of storms and the enemy increased; for after they had arrived at the new destination (μετὰ γὰρ τὴν παραπομπὴν τῶν πλοίων τὴν εἰς Μαρώνειαν 21) Timomachus intervened in the quarrel between Maronea and Thasus over Stryme: παρέπεμπε πάλιν ὁ Τιμόμαχος . . . σῖτον καὶ πελταστάς. The Maroneans drew up their ships to offer battle; and Apollodorus continues with a veritable threnody on the further dangers and hardships he went through because Polycles was still not to be seen: καὶ οὐδέπω οὗτος ἦκεν! In a résumé, finally, the expedition to Hierum is mentioned again (58): the plaintiff states that he had convoyed grain to the Athenians (παρέπεμψα τῷ δήμῳ τὸν σῖτον) that they might be able to buy in a plentiful market, etc.

Heeding a plea of the Eretrians, the Athenians under Diocles in 357 conducted a rapid campaign to dislodge the Thebans from Euboea. As a steward of the sacred trireme Paralus the wealthy Meidias, according to Demosthenes in the invective written probably in 347/6 (Drerup), had instructions: πλεῖν καὶ παραπέμπειν τοὺς στρατιώτας (21.174); actually he arrived after the Thebans had come to terms with Diocles.

Again, when Phocion abandoned the later Euboean campaign of 350, and the volunteer trierarchs convoyed both the infantry and the cavalry from Styra to Athens, Meidias alone (so it is asserted by Demosthenes, 21.167) took no part in the public service: τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων . . . τριηράρχων παραπεμπόντων ὑμᾶς, . . . οὗτος οὐ παρέπεμπεν; instead, he followed the fleet with a cargo of materials for his own estate and for his silver mines.

Piracy and privateering began to flourish as the struggle between Athens and Philip lengthened. Piracy brought about the dispute between Philip and Athens concerning the island of Halonnesus, for which we find evidence in the speech (Dem. 7) by Hegesippus of Sunion. The λῃστῶν φυλακή and the κατὰ θάλατταν φυλακή which the king insisted he wanted to share with the Athenians (14-6) undoubtedly also included direct convoying.

In fact, after the peace of Philocrates in 346 piratical actions were both tolerated and practiced by the traditional guardian of the seas, Athens, in her efforts to stem the growing might of the Macedonian. The convoying of merchant ships was not only necessary because of the presence of pirates, but was offered to, and imposed upon, neutrals by business-minded trierarchs and condottiere generals much after the fashion of the "protection" enforced by gangsters and racketeers in our own times. When, for example, in 342 the energetic Diopeithes of Sunion was sent to the Thracian Chersonese to promote Athenian interests and he received no supplies and not a mina of pay for his mercenaries, he employed his fleet to extort "contributions," εὐνοίας,[4] from coastal and insular cities of Asia Minor such as Chios and Erythrae. This was a common and accepted practice with generals sailing from Athens, states Demosthenes in behalf of Diopeithes (8.24). No altruistic sentiments accompanied the contributions; the donors paid for certain commerce immunities by buying convoy protection (25).

In 340 Athenian and Chalcidian privateering along the coasts of Thessaly forced upon Philip a most unusual method of convoying the ships that were to support his army operating against Byzantium and its allies. In his Letter to the Athenians (Dem. 12.16) he complains that, when he wished to enter the Hellespont with his ships, he was compelled to escort them with his army along the Chersonese coast: ἠναγκάσθην αὐτὰς παραπέμψαι.

Two passages in documents interpolated in Demosthenes' speech For the Crown should also be noted.[5] The first is found in a psephism (73-4). This document, purporting to be a resolution moved by Eubulus, deals with the seizure of some Athenian ships by a Macedonian general of Philip in 340; these supposedly were: ἀποσταλέντα σκάφη εἴκοσι ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ σίτου παραπομπήν. As a matter of fact, merchantmen were seized, not warships convoying them.[6] In a letter to the Athenians (77-8, also an interpolated invention) Philip defends the action, claiming that the ships had

[4]Demosthenes 8.25. See K. J. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte III.1² 1923, 550; A. W. Pickard, "Macedonian Supremacy in Greece," CAH 6 (1927), 252; P. Stein, Ueber Piratie im Altertum, Progr. Cöthen 1. Teil (1891), 24-7; Schaefer, op. cit. II.252, note 4; Ormerod op. cit., 118-20.

[5]The pseudo-Demosthenic state documents have once more been subjected to a scholarly analysis by L. Schläpfer, Untersuchungen zu den Attischen Staatsurkunden und den Amphiktyonenbeschlüssen der Demosthenischen Kranzrede, Rhet. Stud. 21. Heft, Schöningh, Paderborn 1939. The time of composition is placed by Schläpfer near the close of the second century B.C. Concerning the present psephism, classified in a very low category among documents which do not harmonize even their basic thoughts with the Attic originals, see his pages 56-61 and 232-3.

[6]Schaefer, op. cit. II.503, note 5; Schläpfer, op. cit., 57-8 and notes. J. Hasebroek, Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece, translated by L. M. Fraser and D. C. MacGregor, G. Bell & Sons, London 1933, 148, still refers to the passage as Demosthenic testimony for a convoy of battleships, as does Ormerod, op. cit., 118.

been sent merely under the pretext of a convoy: ὡς τὸν σῖτον παραπέμψοντα, and that in truth it was their mission to relieve the Selymbrians whom he was besieging.

For the following two decades genuine psephisms mentioning παραπομπαί are recorded in inscriptions. An Athenian decree of (c.) 330, IG II².408, provides a public commendation and crowns of gold for two Heracleote benefactors of Athens. Of these the name of only one, Mnemon, is legible. They had made donations of Sicilian wheat and barley. Testimony in their behalf was rendered by the strategus Diotimus and by Dionysodorus, who had been appointed by the former to convoy the cargo of grain: ὃν κα[τ]έστη[σεν Διότιμος ἐπιμελε]ῖσθαι τῆς παρ[α]πομπῆς . . . (8-10). Concerning Diotimus the editor remarks: "Fortasse est Διότιμος Διοπείθους Εὐωνυμεύς, qui a. 338/7 et 335/4 στρατηγός erat." For the latter date, a catalogue of Athenian ships incorporated in a psephism of the following year, IG II.804Bb, contains a probable reference to convoy service engaged in by Diotimus himself. Regarding two triremes, the Iousa (42) and the Delphis (50), it is stated: αἵδε ἐξέπλευσαν μετὰ στρατηγο(ῦ) Διοτίμου ἐπὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῶν λειστῶν κατὰ ψήφισμα δήμου . . . (32-40). Nine years later, in 326/5, the superintendents of the Piraean navy yard render an account of warships turned over to the strategus Thrasybulus for convoying grain transports, IG II.808a. 37-42.

For the Roman world Polybius makes mention of a convoy of remarkable size. When in 249 the Roman fleet under the consul P. Claudius Pulcher had suffered disaster before Drepana, his colleague, L. Junius Pullus,[7] was sent with provisions and supplies for the hard-pressed army besieging Lilybaeum. Sixty men-of-war acted as a convoy: πρὸς δὲ καὶ παραπομποὺς τούτοις. At Messana ships arriving from Lilybaeum[8] and other Sicilian towns augmented the squadron to 120, while the transport vessels numbered approximately 800 (52.6). Junius now went with all speed to Syracuse. Here he set about procuring additional supplies from the interior, so that the total number of vessels may well have reached a thousand. The subsequent fate of this great fleet is well known, how it was harassed by the Carthaginian admiral Carthalo, taking advantage of its division into two parts by the blundering consul, and then utterly annihilated in a storm.[9]

Some further data regarding the component units and the progress of this great convoy may be gathered from the narrative. The fleet was evidently a most motley collection of bottoms: reporting the approach of the first section of the convoy, Carthalo's lookout men stated that it was a πλῆθος ἱκανὸν πλοίων . . παντοδαπῶν (53.8). Among the 120 escorting σκάφη—apparently the word was favored by Polybius as a designation for warcraft in general[10]—were μακρὰ πλοῖα. The use of this expression meaning 'ships of war' is listed by Liddell-Scott-Jones under πλοῖον: Herodotus 5.30; Thucydides 1.14; I note also Plato, Pol. 298D and Demosthenes 58.55. The finest example of πλοῖον used alone in the sense of 'warship' is in Xenophon, Hell. 1.2.1, where πλοῖα refers back to τριήρεις πεντήκοντα (1.1.34) decreed by the Athenians for the expedition of Thrasylus. Some of his μακρὰ πλοῖα were assigned by Junius to convoy the first half of the ships out of Syracuse (52.7). We further learn (53.9) that this advance section of the fleet was preceded by λέμβοι, small fast-sailing combat ships resembling triremes and equipped with sails and oars and probably also rams, employed in scouting (προπλεῖν) and convoy service.[11]

As is usual with large convoys today, the Roman group of ships must have made slow progress down the Sicilian coast. As much can be inferred from Polybius, who states that at Syracuse the consul Junius awaited the arrival of the ships that had lagged behind en route from Messana (52.8). It is apparent that on this leg of the voyage the enemy was not to be feared and that consequently there was no need to keep the fleet together. Later, when Carthalo's lookout reported that ships of every sort were drawing near in considerable number, the lembi on their part reported back to the quaestors placed in command of this section of the fleet (52.7) that the enemy was at hand (53.9): plainly, in the face of danger the convoying warships were moving only at the speed of the slowest transport vessel.[12]

Two further passages may be noted from Polybius as instancing sea escort for individual persons. When in 203 a Roman embassy appeared at Carthage to report that the peace terms proposed by Scipio had been ratified by the Roman people, and in vain protested the seizure of a fleet of Roman transports, the Carthagin-

[7]According to the Polybius text under discussion (1.52.5), he was a successor of P. Claudius.

[8]W. W. Tarn, JHS 27 (1907) 55, n. 38, remarks that "they must have been sent off before the battle of Drepana."

[9]Cf. Mommsen, Römische Geschichte[9] I.529-30; O. Meltzer, Geschichte der Karthager, Weidmann, Berlin 1896, 2.329-32; T. Frank, "Rome and Carthage: The First Punic War," CAH 7 (1928) 687-8; etc.

[10]Within this same account, 54.3, the Carthaginian warships are so called. The interpolator of Dem. 28.73-4 likewise speaks of them meaning warships. For a brief discussion of the word (ordinarily used for the hull of a ship) and further illustrations from Polybius, cf. E. Obst, P.W.R.-E. III.2.443.

[11]Regarding these (they were also a favorite equipment of the Illyrian pirates) cf. E. Luebeck, Das Seewesen der Griechen und Römer, 1. Teil (Progr. Johanneum), Lütcke & Wolf, Hamburg 1890, 26-30.

[12]Polybius leaves the size of these vessels to conjecture. W. L. Rodgers, Greek and Roman Warfare, United States Naval Institute, Annapolis 1937, 299, thinks that the freighters were "of no more than 10 tons' burden."

ian war party, entertaining an oblique design, urgently suggested that the Roman commission should be assured of a safe return. The motion carried, καὶ παραυτίκα τούτοις ἡτοίμαζον δύο τριήρεις παραπομπούς (15.2.6). The triremes conducted the quinquereme of the Romans to a spot along the Tunisian coast where it was pounced upon by three other Carthaginian triremes.[13]

The second instance concerns Polyaratus of Rhodes, one of the partisans of Perseus whose extradition was demanded by Rome in 167. Ptolemy sent him to Rhodes in a lembus in charge of a certain Demetrius (30.9.2-3). En route, at Phaselis, Polyaratus refused to continue, taking refuge at the town's common hearth. The Rhodians gave ear to the plea of the Phaselites to relieve them of their stubborn townsman, and sent a deckless ship to convoy the lembus bearing him and Demetrius: ἄφρακτον . . . ἐξαπέστειλαν τὸ παραπέμψον (7). Polyaratus now responded to the combined urgings of the Phaselites, the Rhodians, and Demetrius; but scarcely had he boarded the Egyptian vessel again when he changed his mind and escaped to the shore once more. Stopping at Caunus, he addressed a plea to an inland town indebted to him, Cibyrae, to give him shelter and to send an escort (overland, of course): πέμψαι παραπομπήν (13). In their decency the Cibyratae could not refuse the request. But presently they received orders from Aemilius Paullus to forward their unwelcome guest under strict guard, while the Rhodians were instructed φροντίζειν τῆς κατὰ θάλατταν παραπομπῆς (18).

Plutarch (Camillus 8) tells of the hazardous voyage of three prominent Roman citizens sent to Delphi with a precious offering of gold. This had been vowed by Camillus while engaged in the siege of Veii. During a calm the vessel of the delegates was overtaken by Liparaean galleys. Held as pirates, the Romans barely succeeded in obtaining mercy until they could place their case before Timasitheus, ruler of the Liparaeans. He not only set the delegates free, but accompanied them himself with a protective convoy and joined them in the Delphic ceremony: παρέπεμπε καὶ συγκαθιέρωσε τὸ ἀνάθημα.

There are several instances of παραπομπαί received by individuals overland: Diodorus Siculus 20.45.4: In 307 Demetrius Phalereus τῆς ἰδίας ἀσφαείας ἔτυχε παραπομπῆς from Athens to Thebes (cf. also Plutarch, Demetrius 9.2); Polybius 15.5.7: Having intercepted Hannibal's spies near Zama, Scipio treated them remarkably well, δοὺς ἐφόδια καὶ παραπομπήν. Two Delphic inscriptions of the year 180, recording decrees in honor of nine Rhodians and an Athenian sent to settle a dispute over temple precincts and boundaries,

instruct the archons: ἐ]πιμεληθῆμεν . . . [ . . . τὰς ἀ]σφαλείας αὐτῶν ὅπως παραπεμφθέωντι ἄχρι οὗ κα [αὐτοις δοκῆι] SIG³ 614.32-3), and ἐπιμελ[ηθῆν]αι . . . περὶ τᾶς ἀνακομιδᾶς [αὐ]τοῦ, ἵνα παραπεμφθῇ (615.13-4). Early in the third century of the Christian era certain notables at Prusias on the Hypius river are honored for having given escort (παραπέμψαι) to Roman emperors and to the imperial armies (ἱερὰ στρατεύματα); cf. IGRom III.60.6; 62.8-9; 66.12; 68.7-8; 1421.7. Cf. also IG XIV.235.6.

Finally, Onasander, writing about the middle of the first century A.D., gives this instruction for a strategus: Φροντιζέτω δὲ περί τε ἀγορᾶς καὶ τῆς τῶν ἐμπόρων καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν παραπομπῆς (4.14). The hope for a further word of theory illustrating the tactics of ancient convoying is in vain; Onasander merely adds tritely that the general is to make convoy service his business in order to assure the safety and speediness of the traders' deliveries.

Terminologically this consideration of what the Greeks called convoying should also look briefly to a supposed surrogate for παραπομπή mentioned in Cicero's correspondence. When in the troublous summer of 44 the orator decided to avoid Rome temporarily and to visit his student son at Athens, the matter of transportation gave him some concern: Achaean pirates and the legions returning to Antony from Macedonia made the voyage seem a dangerous undertaking. He thought, therefore, of sailing with M. Brutus who had been commissioned with a curatio frumenti in Asia. On July 8th Cicero writes to Atticus (Att. 16.1.3): Ἐν ὁμοπλοίᾳ Bruti videtur aliquid praesidii esse. Referring to this passage, Ormerod states (op. cit., 118, n. 3) that "the phrase . . . has every appearance of being the technical term for sailing in convoy." Whatever Cicero's actual intentions may have been, there is no further documentary support for Ormerod's surmise. The phrase occurs only here. In fact, the word ὁμόπλοια is found only here and in letters written by Cicero on the two following days (Att. 16.5.3 and 4). The ὁμόπλοια was a proposed "sailing-together" of the ships of Brutus and a group of friends, Domitius, Sestius, Bucilianus and others (Att. 16.4.4). It is not clear whether Cicero thought of joining Brutus as a passenger or of tagging along with the three yachts (actuariola decemscalma) with which he finally began the voyage alone (Att. 16.3.6). The latter seems all the more improbable because the actuariola are not mentioned until the delay of Brutus has caused Cicero to give up the plan of sailing with him, and, when he had arrived at Bruttian Vibo, he was considering making a change at Rhegium from the yachts to a larger vessel (Att. 16.6.1).

Perseus, we are told by Livy, early in 168 developed

[13]Livy states (30.25.5) that the attacking ships were quadriremes.

a lively naval activity,[14] giving attention above all to the safe conduct of grain ships headed for Macedonia (44.28.1-5). This is, I think, the most detailed mention of convoy protection in Latin. It begins:

> Perseus . . . Antenorem et Callipum praefectos classis cum quadraginta lembis—adiectae ad hunc numerum quinque pristes erant—Tenedum mittit, ut inde sparsas per Cyclades insulas naves cum frumento petentes, *tutarentur*.

The lembi, we have already seen, were rather small, though very effective, warcraft. In fact, their repeated mention in connection with convoy service suggests comparing them with our own destroyers, indispensable in the same service today. The pristes (πρίστεις) were also naves rostratae, ships of great maneuverability often used in naval actions of the third and second centuries B.C.[15]

Perseus' fleet set out from Cassandrea, below Mt. Athos. Arriving at Tenedos, it found some Rhodian vessels in the harbor. These, under the command of Eudamus and probably about their traditional business of guarding the seas,[16] were permitted to depart unmolested. Presently, though, it was learned that on the opposite side of the island fifty Macedonian merchantmen were bottled up by a flotilla of Pergamean warships: quinquaginta onerarias suarum stantibus in ostio portus Eumenis rostratis . . . inclusas esse (4). Perseus' ships removed the blockade at once, and ten lembi were told off to convoy the freighters to Macedonia: onerarias, datis qui *prosequerentur* decem lembis, in Macedoniam mittit (Antenor), ita ut *in tutum prosecuti* redirent Tenedum (5). Eight days later the lembi rejoined the fleet, now stationed at Sigeum.

Of the words italicized as describing the act of giving naval protection, *tutari* is a very general term which does not appear to occur elsewhere relative to convoying. However, the second verb, *prosequi*, is used frequently to designate such service. It is readily recognized as a technical term quite as constant as the Greek παραπέμπειν. I have noted the following additional examples:

Cicero, In Verrum act. 2.1.52: The Chian Charidemus, Cicero states, had already testified concerning an incident that happened when he was trierarch: cum esset trierarchus et Verrem ex Asia decedentem *prosequeretur*.

Cicero, In Verrem act. 2.1.52: The Chian Charihoodwinked the Milesians in a unique manner. He asked them for a convoy: Milesios navem poposcit,

quae eum praesidii causa Myndum *prosequeretur*. They gave him a first-class myoparo,[17] one of ten they owned: illi statim myoparonem egregium de sua classe ornatum atque armatum dederunt. Hoc praesidio Myndum profectus est. At Myndus he bade the sailors and soldiers to return to Miletus on foot, while he himself sold the ship to some enemies of Rome. Cicero asks (87): Navem tu de classe populi Romani, quam tibi Milesia civitas ut te *prosequeretur*, dedisset, ausus es vendere?

Livy 5.28.4: Livy also tells the story of the Roman delegation saved and convoyed by Timasitheus: legatos cum praesidio navium Delphos *prosecutus*, Romam inde sospites restituit.

Livy 30.25.3: This is Livy's version of the treachery practiced by the Carthaginians upon the Roman embassy of 203. The Romans themselves, he asserts, had requested convoy protection: petierunt a magistratibus . . . ut naves mitterent quae se *prosequerentur*.

Tacitus, Historiae 2.9: Galba assigned the provinces of Galatia and Pamphylia to Calpurnius Asprenas. The escort assigned him was two triremes from the fleet at Misenum: datae e classe Misenensi duae triremes ad *prosequendum*.

Livy 30.29.3: This passage is added to show how closely the use of the term *prosequi* tallies with that of παραπέμπειν; like παραπέμπειν, it also designates escorting overland. The Polybian narrative (15.5.7, see above) of Scipio's treatment of Hannibal's spies is repeated: datis qui *prosequerentur*, retro ad Hannibalem dimisit.

In these passages attention might be called also to the recurrence of the word *praesidium*. Certainly "cum *praesidio* navium *prosequi*" is a most comprehensive description of the act of convoying. It reminds one of the isolated, very late (fifth-century) term used by Ps.-Asconius (In act. II in Verr. 1.86), *praesidiaria classis*. The phrase *praesidii causa* of Cicero also occurs elsewhere in reference to convoying at sea. Thus, arguing that Verres had no right to accept a ship from the Mamertines, Cicero states (In Verr. 5.45) that the state makes all necessary provisions in this matter: *praesidii . . . causa* sumptu publico navigia praebentur. Again, defending L. Flaccus de repetundis, Cicero claims (Pro Flac. 27) that the fleet fitted out by requisitions from the Asiatic provincials was a necessity: non solum *praesidii*, sed etiam ornandi imperii *causa* navigandum fuisse. He also asks (ib. 28): Quod si etiam *praesidii causa* classem habuit, quis erit tam iniquus qui reprehendat?

But in only one of the instances cited above, In Verr. act. II 1.52, are the verb *prosequi* and the motivating or explanatory phrase *praesidii causa* actually used to-

---

[14]Cf. B. Niese, Geschichte der Griechischen und Makedonischen Staaten, Perthes, Gotha 1893-1903, III.154-6.

[15]See evidence collected by Luebeck, op. cit., 26-9.

[16]Perseus at this time had jockeyed Genthius into war against the Romans (Livy 44.27.7ff.), and Illyrian lembi were roving about (Polybius 29.11.3; Livy 44.29.6). On Rhodian policing of the seas (following Athens) see Ormerod, op. cit., 133-9; M. Rostovtzeff, "Rhodes, Delos and Hellenistic Commerce," CAH 8 (1930) 619-67.

[17]Myoparones, originally fast-sailing pirate craft, frequently found service with war fleets: Luebeck, op. cit., 30-1.

gether; it would seem that the old-Latin Nebenbegriff of 'protection' associated with *pro* (its long vowel shortened in composition[18]) was still felt sufficiently in the classical period. It was unnecessary to isolate further the technical sense of *prosequi* from the verb's more common application[19]—within the code of Roman *urbanitas*—to designate 'following', 'accompanying', 'attending', 'escorting' honoris, officii causa.

J. C. PLUMPE

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

# REVIEWS

**Reflexive Verbs. Latin, Old French, Modern French.** By ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER. 213 pages. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 1942 (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Volume XLIII) $1.25

In this book, which will be of interest to Romance scholars no less than to students of Latin, Dr. Hatcher has performed a most difficult task: to review material which has been worked over by many scholars and to give it fresh significance by virtue of her sound attention to fact, the vigor of her theories, and the enthusiasm which she brings to her presentation. The latter quality can be a dangerous one, as well as the source of great power. Dr. Hatcher has avoided being carried away, but she has dared to inject into her text the breath of life: " . . . the real substratum, the matrix of the mighty system [of reflexive verbs] that was to be, was living and dynamic: created because once heroes were quick to their feet, swift to the saddle, and off in the twinkling of an eye!" (146). "Poetry, laughter, fiction, as well as logic, analysis, and analogy, have proved to be creative factors in the development of the reflexive construction, and to recognize the efficacy of these forces is surely not unscientific" (9). Such passages however are not too numerous, for the author is more concerned with presenting the facts of the evolution, and with interpreting their significance, than with sharing her own delight at the beauty, the seemingly inevitable rightness of linguistic process. And it is without surprise that one notes the dedication: "To / Leo Spitzer / Who believes that language is poetry / I dedicate this labor based on statistical compilation / In which the figures seemed,- somehow, / To add up to poetry."

The book is quite naturally, considering the title, divided into three parts, preceded by an Introduction, which bears the subtitle: *Genera Verbi* in Latin. In this chapter the author has surveyed the history and development of the "R-form verbs," i.e. deponents, mediopassives and passives. With the passives we are not concerned; the mediopassives enter the discussion somewhat later.

The deponents, on the other hand, are presented as offering by and large a strong contrast with the active verbs (at least in their original significance), namely that whereas the active expresses an act pure and simple, the deponent of similar meaning (*sequor* vs. *curro*) adds to that basic idea of activity, one of involvement of the subject (16). In this matter Latin seems to have been less vital than Sanskrit or Greek in its possibilities of creation: it was not possible to derive from *duco* 'I lead' the form *ducor* 'I lead away as my own, in matrimony' (19) (cf. ἄγω, ἄγομαι). But Latin did possess another pattern of derivation: "to choose a stem referring to some element of recognized significance which conditions the activity of the subject, and to cast the verb into the R-construction in order to represent the subject as involved, occupied, in certain pursuits or behavior" (21). Thus Latin evolves the verb *uxoror*, but also, possibly later, extends the meaning of *duco* (*in matrimonium*) (25) to express that idea, and, "with such competition from active verbs, it is not surprising if, in the common speech, deponent verbs lost their desinences and came to merge with the triumphant active voice . . . development of the Active and . . . weakening of the Deponent" (25). "Thus finally a complete mediopassive system is evolved . . ." (27) particularly in the expression of process and physical movement, in which there is a pattern of contrast between "natural process" and "induced process" (*ardeo* vs. *incendor*). This pattern in turn gives rise to "secondary intransitives": given *mutor* 'I undergo change (induced)', a "tendential or static reference" is attached to an active (intransitive) form *muto* 'I change' as in *tempora mutant* expressing the change-*ability* of the times," while the possibly later *tempora mutantur* "presents the 'times' as actually changing" (31). This secondary intransitive is but one of the forms threatening the survival of the (mediopassive) R-form. The other threat comes from the development of the reflexive construction (37).

In the following the evolution of the reflexive verb through the three periods chosen, Dr. Hatcher establishes the permanence, with some variations, of three patterns:

---

18Cf. Stolz-Schmalz, Lateinische Grammatik, (ed. 5 by Leumann-Hofmann), Beck, Munich 1928, 534; Ernout-Meillet, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine2, Klincksieck, Paris 1939.

19An excellent discussion of the word in this sense is found in M. Seyffert's old, but still extremely valuable, edition of M. Tullii Ciceronis Laelius sive De Amicitia Dialogus (Mit einem Commentar zum Privatgebrauch für reifere Gymnasialschüler und angehende Philologen), Müller, Brandenburg 1844, 149.

Pattern I, in which an activity is represented as performed by the subject upon himself, as he would upon another:

Latin:   alium verbero > me verbero (39)
OF:                    (des poinz) se fiert, Eneas 1250 (77)
MF:                    je me frappe (149)

Pattern II, in which there is an extension of the part, physical or non-physical, to the whole:

Latin:   aliquid (vitam) devoveo > me devoveo (46)
           membra abluo          me abluo, etc.
OF.                  (cors vestir)    soi vestir, But rarely
                                          soi laver (87)
MF:                  (raser la barbe)    se raser (154)

Pattern III, in which the verb "describes the activity of the subject in the terms of efficacy of a means":

Latin:   facio aliquod quo dirumpor > me dirumpo (56)
OF.   (not very frequent)
        Tant en boivent que tuit se tuënt,
        lez les feus gisent, ne remuent, Eneas 4901 (92)
MF:      (much extended in use)
          je me suis séché auprès du feu (157)

In addition reflexive verbs are considered under various headings: A—With Animate Subject; B—With Inanimate Subject; and subheadings: Verbs of Emotional and Nervous Reaction; Verbs of Movement.

In the course of the discussion of the Reflexive in Old French, Dr. Hatcher has naturally been led to a consideration of the development of the conjugation with *être* as auxiliary· This is a particularly interesting and useful section of the chapter.

In spite of the very large number of quotations, and the consequent multiple chances for misprints, the text is remarkably free from errors. Only these few, obviously minor mistakes were noted: . . . nos defendet ne nos susted (84 n.10) is correctly quoted (110) . . . ne nos usted . . .; soir seoir (107 n.54) should read soi seoir; Je ne suis assez bête (194) Je ne suis pas assez . . . JR 106; L'idée de déménager m'exaltait immensément (195) l'almanach provençal qui se publie en (à) Avignon; se connaitre (198) for se connaître.

Dr. Hatcher has shed important light upon a hitherto insufficiently studied phenomenon in the Latin-to-French continuum· And it is with pleasure that the reader observes the sensitiveness and imagination with which she holds up the linguistic evidences as a mirror to the mentality of the speakers and writers in the several periods.

ERNEST F. HADEN

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY

## Two Aspects of Chivalry.  Pulci and Boiardo.

By GIACOMO GRILLO.  xi, 59 pages.  Excelsior Press, Boston 1942  $1

The contents of this booklet, not given by the author, may be analyzed as follows:

The preface teems with such names as Tasso, Ariosto, Homer, Byron, Voltaire, Leonardo, Taine, Shakespeare, Foscolo, Milton, Rabelais, De Sanctis, Columbus, Vespucci, Cabot, Toscanelli, Renaissance, Horace, Virgil, Politian, Lorenzo de' Medici, Marlowe, and of course Pulci and Boiardo. They are names to delight the heart and mind of any cultured person, especially if he has been immersed all his life in literature and literary criticism,

        nec partem solido demere de die
        spernit

to dream of adventures and discoveries in the company of the great adventurers and discoverers of history.

In a sense it is unfortunate that a preface is actually an epilogue and not a prologue. It is the place where an author muses upon what his spirit has visualized during the writing of a certain work, but not necessarily upon what he has in fact expressed in writing.

Those names blazon a promise of great things about to come. This promise, however, is not kept. The title of the booklet is somewhat misleading. A large part of the essays does not deal with chivalry at all. Pietro Bembo and Iacopo Sanazzaro enter ill at ease under such a title even in an appendix. Here and there balance is lacking in the development of the topics. For instance the writer describes four possible aims (10-1) for the Morgante Maggiore. Pulci composed it (a) as a

satire of the Church, or (b) as a satire of chivalry, or (c) to parade his ideas in order to attract attention at the court of Lorenzo, or (d) simply to amuse himself. He discusses only the first (11-6), and then, rather abruptly, he tells us (16) that the fourth was the poet's principal aim, while the second was "partially" heeded.

Without any doubt in the Morgante humor plays an important rôle: its treatment should have been commensurate. The author merely hints at its many aspects (17). Then he passes briefly to the plot, material, sources, and once more he pauses, quite rightly, to present the main characters of the poem, particularly Orlando, Rinaldo, Morgante, Margutte and Astarotte. The latter has a special charm for us Americans, since he foretold the discovery of this continent (Pulci who died in 1487 obtained his information from his friend the scientist Toscanelli, who in turn imparted the same information to his other friend Columbus).

Since Grillo is viewing Pulci's literary activity as a whole, with profit he might have devoted a dozen pages instead of four lines to the poet's influence upon Cervantes, Voltaire, Rabelais, Berni, Aretino, Pier Iacopo Martelli, Carlo Gozzi, Folengo and Giusti. A golden opportunity was missed at this point.

The essay on Boiardo is smaller and shows a meagre treatment. The author was not properly advised in offering this opusculum in its present form to the world of scholars. Obviously he has an abundance of interesting material at his disposal. He should rewrite the whole study 'senza fretta, e dovrebbe badar un po' di più all'uso dell'idioma inglese.' He should eliminate the many misprints, check his references, and make use of his authorities in a consistent and satisfactory manner.

An outstanding work may well be written on Pulci and Boiardo as two different exponents of chivalry in Italy.

RAYMOND MANDRA

HUNTER COLLEGE

### Documents of the Primitive Church. By CHARLES CUTLER TORREY. xviii, 309 pages. Harper, New York 1941 $3.50

Charles Cutler Torrey, author of this work on the higher criticism of the New Testament, is professor emeritus of Semitic languages at Yale University and author of about fifteen books in his field. Himself a higher critic of the bolder and destructive sort, he challenges the whole school of modern higher criticism and declares it bankrupt. This book is an introduction to the question of the Aramaic origin of the New Testament.

Briefly, Professor Torrey's idea is that, since the first generation of Christians was Jewish-Christian and since the language of these Jews was the Aramaic, they must have received the Gospels and other New Testament writings in Aramaic. Not till the second generation, when the Gentiles got the ascendancy in the congregations, was the Aramaic New Testament translated into the Greek. Our Greek Testament is, then, not the original New Testament; it is a translation of an older, lost Aramaic original. On this theory, Dr. Torrey has thrust the date of the Gospels a full generation of time downward, nearer to the time of Christ. Mark, for example, has been brought back to the year 40 A.D., instead of 60, or 70, or 80, or some later date. Matthew came soon after Mark, perhaps before the year 50, hardly later. Skipping Luke, John, the Acts and Epistles, Professor Torrey settles down on the Apocalypse as being, like Mark and Matthew, Aramaic in origin and early in date, about 68 A.D. instead of 95.

A great many non-Semitic scholars may not know exactly what Aramaic is. Now the languages of the world may roughly be grouped, on the basis of descent from Noah, into three major groups: the Japhetic (Aryan), Hamitic, and Semitic. The Semitic group, to which Aramic belongs, is the smallest group, and least diversified in its grammatical forms. Its various families present a close and compact relationship. About eight per cent of the population of the world is Semitic, 50 per cent is Japhetic, 42 per cent is Hamitic. Of the 5000 or more languages in the world, one per cent is Semitic, 24 per cent are Japhetic, 75 per cent are Hamitic. One of the characteristics of the Semitic languages is their triconsonantal roots. Looking at a printed page of Aramaic, one is apt to mistake it for Hebrew. There are, of course, differences, not a few, in the consonants, vowel pointings, modifications, meaning of words, etc. But they are distinctly cognate languages. Similarly, there is much likeness between Danish and Norwegian, so great that one has no trouble in talking to a man of the other tongue without a translator. The Dutch and the Flemish are almost identical. The Spanish and the Portuguese have much in common. Naturally, Aramaic like all other living tongues developed dialects. It was spoken in Aram by the Arameans. Aram was a name given to the countries of Mesopotamia, Syria, and adjacent lands, including at times Chaldea and Babylonia, Palestine and Sinaitica. For several centuries it was the commercial and diplomatic language of western Asia. Among the dialects may be noted the Egyptian, the Babylonian, the Syrian, the Samaritan, the Judaean, the Galilean, etc. In Matthew 26:73 we note that the damsel could tell from Peter's dialect that he was from Galilee. There was some difference, but not necessarily great, as one notes differences between Brooklyn and Manhattan in English dialect. In Judges 12:6 is recorded a case where the Ephramites could not pronounce "shibboleth" (in Hebrew) the way the Gileadites did, and it cost them their heads. Some think that

the Jews during the Babylonian Captivity lost the use of the Hebrew tongue and took up Chaldee instead. It seems from Nehemiah 8:8 that the returning Jews needed an interpreter when the Hebrew was publicly read. The Aramaic dialects of Palestine are often called Chaldee, on account of the theory, in some measure true, that the Aramaic used in Palestine was that which was brought back from the Captivity· It is supposed that Christ spoke the Galilean Aramaic. Syriac, once an Aramaic dialect, has developed into a distinct language.

The Old Testament was written in Hebrew, with the exception of 66 verses in Ezra and 158 in Daniel, and a few verses elsewhere in Aramaic. In the Greek New Testament there are no verses in Aramaic, but now and then an Aramaic word is used, as in Mark 5:41, "Talitha cumi," which in Greek reads, "τὸ κοράσιν, ἔγειρε" and in English, "damsel, arise." Dr. Torrey's claim is that the presence of Aramaisms and Hebraisms in the Greek New Testament is internal proof that the New Testament was first written in Aramaic. It would perhaps not affect the authenticity of the New Testament as the inspired Word of God even if he were right. In the absence of the Aramaic originals, his argumentation, though long and learned, is not very convincing. Palestine was a bilingual country. Naturally, Jesus and the Twelve used Hebrew and Aramaic expressions at times. We use some Indian words in this country, and immigrants from Europe have brought many words and expressions from their homelands. "Hiawatha" is not necessarily a translation from an Indian original. Jesus on the cross cried with a loud voice saying "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani." And Paul in Jerusalem spoke both Greek and Hebrew (Aramaic?). One of the great curiosities in my possession is a work of higher criticism entitled The Polychrome Bible, an edition of the Old Testament printed on a background of various colors to indicate the various literary sources of the text. The argument was so crazy that it killed itself. It remains to be seen now what Professor Torrey can make out of his theory of the Aramaic origin of the New Testament. I am very happy to think that modern negative criticism has gone, to use Dr. Torrey's word, "bankrupt·"

O. M. NORLIE

ST. OLAF COLLEGE

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Compiled by Lionel Casson and Bluma L. Trell from such bibliographical publications as reach this country, and from books received at the editorial offices. Prices have not been confirmed.

### EPIGRAPHY. NUMISMATICS. PAPYROLOGY

BUXTORF, PETER. Die lateinischen Grabinschriften in der Stadt Basel. 224 pages. Helbing & Lichtenhahn, Basel 1940 (Dissertation) 4.80M.

FONTENROSE, JOSEPH E. Notes on Some Didymaean Inscriptions. 10 pages. University of California Press, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1942 (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 12, No. 9)

LOBEL, E. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XVIII. Edited with translations and notes by E. LOBEL, C. H. ROBERTS, and E. P. WEGENER. xii, 215 pages, frontispiece, 14 plates. Egypt Exploration Society, London 1941 ($5.25)

Merlin et Cage. L'Année épigraphique. Année 1939. 116 pages. Presses Universitaries de France, Paris 1940 35 fr.

Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Volume 3, The Lockett Collection. Part 3: Plates. 12 pages, ill. Oxford University Press, London 1942 17/6

WORRELL, WILLIAM H., Ed. Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection. 388 pages, ill. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor 1942 $5

### HISTORY. SOCIAL STUDIES

GLOVER, T. R. The Challenge of the Greek and Other Essays. 252 pages. University Press, Cambridge 1942 12/6

GODOLPHIN, FRANCIS R. B. The Greek Historians. The complete and unabridged works of Herodotus (translated by George Rawlinson), Thucydides (translated by Benjamin Jowett), Xenophon (translated by Henry G. Dakyns), Arrian (translated by Edward J. Chinnock). Edited with an Introduction, revisions, and additional notes. Vol. 1: xxxviii, 1001 pages; Vol. 2· iv, 964 pages. Random House, New York 1942 $5

GRAEBER, ISAQUE. Jews in the Gentile World: The Problem of Antisemitism. Macmillan, New York 1941 $4

KIDD, B. J. Documents illustrative of the history of the Church. Volume 3, c. 500-1500. 248 pages. SPCK, London 1941 7/6

RICHARDS, GRANT. Housman 1897-1936. With an Introduction by Mrs. E. W. Symons and Appendices by G. B. A. Fletcher and Others. xxii, 495 pages, ill. Oxford University Press, New York 1942 $4

RUSH, ALFRED C. Death and Burial in Christian Antiquity. xxviii, 282 pages, 8 plates. Catholic University of America Press, Washington 1941 (Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity No. 1) $2.50

SHAW, CHANDLER. History of Ancient Culture from Demosthenes to Diocletian. 404 pages, ill. University Lithoprinters, Ypsilanti 1942 $3.50

STACE, W. T. The Destiny of Western Man. xi, 322 pages. Reynal & Hitchcock, New York 1942 $3

STEINDORFF, GEORGE and KEITH C. SEELE. When Egypt Ruled the East. 300 pages, ill., maps. University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1942 $4

SUHR, ELMER G. Two Currents in the Thought Stream of Europe. xi, 469 pages. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 1942 (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 33) $5

### MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

RYAN, GRANGER and HELMUT RIPPERGER. Jacobus De Voragine, The Golden Legend, a Translation of Legenda Sanctorum. 2 volumes. 356, 425 pages. Longmans, Green, New York 1941 $5